



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

on the origin of comedy, which includes a fresh and suggestive treatment of Epicharmus, Old Comedy is considered in detail, so far as the year 405 B. C. With the Frogs of Aristophanes, which came out in this year, we have the end of an era, and of a chapter. In Chapter III the Ecclesiazusae and the Plutus of Aristophanes keep company with Middle Comedy. Chapter IV is given to Menander. The heart of the book is of course Chapter II. Although Aristophanes dominates, his great contemporaries, Cratinus and Eupolis, are not forgotten. So, too, Teleclides and Pherecrates are mentioned to illustrate the fact that Old Comedy before Aristophanes was not exclusively devoted to personal and political attack, but used folk-lore motives and even real life. Körte points out that travesty of mythological subjects and portrayal of real life are a stream that can be traced as far back as Epicharmus, a stream that Aristophanes makes us forget, but one that flowed on until it emerged in the comedy of the fourth century.

Körte's judgment of Aristophanes is summed up in the words, 'the great political comedy of Athens is one of the wonders of the Greek world, in its way as distinguished and as inimitable as the Parthenon or the Hermes of Praxiteles'. Along with analysis of the extant comedies and comment upon the action and quality of the several pieces, Körte gives, each time in its chronological place, a detailed account of two works which within recent years have been in part recovered, the Dionysalexandros of Cratinus and the Demoi of Eupolis. He points out, in the case of the former, Cratinus, that two old elements of comedy, travesty and political abuse, are present, although in an imperfect blend. The Demoi of Eupolis, which received high praise in antiquity, is summarized by Körte, who traces clearly the outlines of a real comedy of political satire. Among the plays of Aristophanes the Birds is singled out for special treatment as being the most brilliant, while at the same time the author finds in it two signs that Old Comedy has reached its zenith: one, the fact that the *agon* is no longer a real contest, and the other, the fact that the poet here seeks to bring the parabasis into organic relation with the rest of the piece, with the result that the local root is severed. The parabasis in all its lusty vigor, surcharged with fighting spirit, is found in the Knights; in the Birds the fighting spirit is gone. In the Thesmophoriazusae are noted gradual changes, suggestive of Middle Comedy; the beginnings of characterization, and the exposition made without dropping the comic mask.

The Ecclesiazusae and the Plutus are put in the category of Middle Comedy. In this chapter Körte deals to very good purpose with the influence exerted by later Euripidean tragedy, in that by an assimilation of form Greek comedy became like tragedy in structure and incident, and particularly in the use of the motive of love, which was introduced by Euripides, was presumably used by Middle Comedy, and demonstrably by New Comedy.

The chapter on New Comedy is wholly devoted to Menander, whom Körte praises, but with discrimination. Menander's great strength he finds in characterization, not in incident, for names and incidents are repeated in plays which are essentially different. 'Paradoxical as it may sound, the action and its pre-suppositions are for the poet a matter of indifference'. Considerable extracts from the New Menander are given to illustrate the poet's skill and ethical purpose; for example, Körte finds in the slave Daos (Davus) not a mere jolly, impudent fellow, like Sandy (Xanthos) in Aristophanes, but an individual character, morally superior to his betters.

The opening chapters in both books on origins invite comment, but I have space for only brief reference. Körte regards comedy as a blend of at least two elements, the Athenian *comus* and a particular type of Peloponnesian clown, who was *μεγαλογαστρωρ και μεγαλόπυγος και φαλλικός*. This clown was originally not a man but an attendant of Dionysus, distinct from both the equine and the caprine sort. His existence is inferred from two facts, the known costume of the comic actor in Athens, and the known costume of the Italian *phlyaces*. This clown, upon festive occasions, relieved the *comus* when its members were out of breath; these two elements, clown and *comus*, originally mere associates, later became one group, and so comedy arose. The process of blending can no longer be followed in its details, 'but the whole history of Attic comedy consists in the ever renewed effort to weld into an artistic whole these two heterogeneous parts'. The relation of Dionysus to comedy, then, was through the actor as well as through the chorus; and this may even have been the closer relation. As for the origin of tragedy, Geffcken holds fast to the doctrine that the dithyramb out of which tragedy came had originally something of levity in it, and that the satyr play is this levity in segregated form. This is distinct from the newer view represented by Professor Flickinger, that the satyr play is throughout an independent development. These are but two points in the discussion of origins, a subject of endless interest.

HAMILTON COLLEGE.

EDWARD FITCH.

'ΟΙ πολέμοι 1912-1913, 'The War 1912-1913'. By Gregorios Xenopoulos. Athens: Joannes D. Kollaros (1920). 7 Drachmas.

'The War', by Gregorios Xenopoulos, a leading novelist and playwright of contemporary Greece, is a story of Athenian life during the momentous events of 1912 and 1913 which mark the end of a period of national humiliation and the beginning of a new era for Greece. The plot is woven around the two chief characters, Helle and Paul. Helle is the daughter of an Athenian aristocrat, who felt the new impulse long before the outbreak of the Balkan Wars. She has faith in the world about her, and her ideals are untarnished by the luxurious surroundings among which she

has been brought up. Her whole family, too, does its best to cultivate her natural aspirations. Both her father and her mother are examples of rectitude; they engage busily in humanitarian activities for the purpose of making the world a better place to live in. On the other hand, Paul, the object of Helle's affections, belongs to a set of upstarts who live in an atmosphere of abject materialism and selfishness. Under the evil genius of Paul's oldest brother Pericles, Helle's sincere love for Paul is looked upon by Paul's whole family as a splendid commercial enterprise. Paul, who at the beginning does not feel much love for Helle, allows himself to become an instrument in the hands of his calculating brother. Pericles dictates Paul's love letters for him, and when old Karterias, Helle's father, refuses to countenance the match, Pericles suggests and arranges an elopement. But Karterias is firm and the young couple after their escapade are thrown back upon their own resources. Helle faces the new situation with pluck and determination, but Paul is unable to follow her. Disillusion and disappointment come very fast after the romantic union. Paul is found gambling away his wife's savings, stealing her jewelry, and even betraying her love. Too proud to acknowledge her defeat to her father, and unable to rid herself of her love for Paul, Helle sets about reforming him. It is just then that the Balkan War breaks out. Paul's family is unable to feel the new currents; they prophesy defeat and humiliation like that of 1897. They feel sure of the degeneracy of the people and of the impotence of the little State to liberate the millions of Greeks under the Turkish rule. In the crisis they seem to be hopeless slackers. But the national victory comes soon to Helle's assistance. The new spirit reaches even Paul. Nicephoros, an old school friend, who has come from far-off Montevideo to enlist in the army of Greece, stirs him up and Paul finally agrees to volunteer. Here a lovely idyl is interwoven, the story of the love which brings Nicephoros and Zaira, Helle's younger sister, together, and which ends tragically with the death of Nicephoros on the field. Paul is wounded and is brought back to Athens. Old Karterias is at last reconciled, and Paul is ready to turn over a new leaf. His entire family, too, has felt the effects of the national regeneration and even Pericles begins to see life from a more wholesome point of view.

The plot cannot escape the charge of being sentimental; in more than one work Xenopoulos is exposed to that charge. It is one of the reasons that have aroused many a critic against him, especially those of the Athenian literary weekly *Noumas*, who never miss an opportunity to assail him. Xenopoulos is accused of playing to the galleries and of lowering his art to meet the low standards of the populace. But he defends himself by claiming that his power to move a larger audience should not be counted against him. Why should he write if he is not to be read by the people who above all need such reading?

Xenopoulos, after all, does not pretend to be a model.

He is very explicit on that point in his own Preface. He does not hesitate to express his views rather militantly. He is irritated by the insinuation of his opponents that for the love of money he has lowered his art to 'journalism', if I may so translate somewhat freely the untranslatable *ἐπιφύλλα*, and he calls the critics severely to task for their superficial judgment of a conscientiously planned and executed story:

'No, it is not the result of vulgar and false patriotism, but, rather a human work of psychological and sociological interest. Of course, it portrays a period of patriotic activity and enthusiasm, but it does this only to show the influence which the atmosphere created by them has had on certain characters'.

The student of antiquity will recall more than one example of self-vindication among ancient writers. It is a peculiar characteristic of Xenopoulos to preface many of his works with somewhat acrimonious justifications of his methods of writing. I do not know whether he succeeds in carrying out his intentions, especially with readers who are unacquainted with the adverse criticisms he endeavors to overthrow. The fact is established, however, that modern Athenian reviewers frequently engage in polemics.

In spite of any defects, 'The War' presents an entertaining plot and is written with the ease and naturalness which characterise most of Xenopoulos's work. There are passages in it of considerable charm and once at least a strong element of pathos reveals a flash of power. There is much delicacy in the delineation of characters, most of whom are life-like, well-defined individuals, achieving expression without the assistance of melodramatic scenes or of mechanical actions. The style is facile and free of any blatant purisms or of riotous demoticisms. Extremists on both sides are dissatisfied with him because of this cautious eclecticism, but it may be one of the chief reasons of his popularity. The 'golden mean' appeals to the Hellenic masses still, and Xenopoulos is eager to reach a wider public. He believes that drama and story must be open to the people as well as to the élite. To those who accuse him of courting popularity he might retort by quoting from the *Trisevyene*, a tragedy of Kostas Palamas, the words spoken by Panos Tratas to show the result of unintelligible literature on the people:

'I don't know much about books; and if I ever come across any I could not understand them and they could not touch my soul. Educated men don't write them for us'.

On that score, Xenopoulos can sleep with light conscience.

ARISTIDES E. PHOUTRIDES.

Hellenism. By Norman Bentwich. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America (1920). Pp. 386.

The author of this book needs no introduction to American readers. His published writings upon legal doctrine and procedure and upon various aspects of Judaism already total at least nine volumes, not to